

REMARKS

Claims **1-8, 10-20** and **22-31** are pending in the application.

Claims **1-8, 10-20** and **22-31** stand rejected.

Claims **1, 5-8, 11, 20, 22, 24, 25** and **31** have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 8, 11, 20, 24, and 25 can be found, at least, within paragraphs [0010]-[0016] of the specification. Amendments to claims **5-7, 22** and **31** have been made for consistency with the independent claims on which they respectively depend.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-8, 10-19, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as purportedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have amended these claims to address the Examiner's rejections. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-13, 25-26, and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,831,609 ("London"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 10, and 25 to recite: (1) an integration system that is communicatively coupled to an internal business application and an external business application; (2) the integration system receiving a request from the internal business application; (3) the integration system sending the request to the external business application; (4) the integration system, in response to the sending the request, receiving a response from the external business application; and (5) the integration system sending external business application information to the internal business application. The claimed organization of elements in accomplishing the claimed integrating is entirely absent from London. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that London fails to teach, show, or suggest these newly claimed limitations, among other limitations.

Further, Applicants submit that London fails to show the elements of the claimed integrating and integration system, in part because London's system is simply intended to provide a user at a remote terminal with remote access to an application running on another terminal. *See* London Abstract. London does not envision anything like two separate applications communicating through an integration system in order to integrate business application information from an external business application into an internal business application.

Not only does London fail to teach the claimed elements, but London does not even disclose any elements that can be interpreted by an ordinary artisan to teach features comparable to those of the claimed invention. In other words, London's system does not disclose any manner of system comparable to the claimed integration system, much less one that is capable of allowing an internal business application to request external business application information from an external business application, and more specifically, where the internal business application integrates the external business application information with internal business application information. Without anything like an internal business application integrating external business application information from an external business application, it follows that London must also fail to disclose anything even remotely comparable to an integration system capable of facilitating such integration.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that London fails to provide disclosure of all the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, 10, and 25, and all claims depending therefrom, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,761,673 B1, issued to Bookman et al. ("Bookman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to recite limitations similar to limitations newly added to independent claim 1. Applicants submit that these new limitations render Bookman irrelevant in part because Bookman is not cited against any of the limitations of claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 20 is now in condition for allowance for reasons similar to the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Bookman in view of Hallberg et al, "Using Microsoft Excel 97", published by Que Corporation, copyright 1997 Que Corporation ("Hallberg"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 24 has been amended to recite limitations similar to limitations newly added to independent claim 1. Applicants submit that these new limitations render both Bookman and Hallberg irrelevant in part because Bookman is not cited against any of the limitations of claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 20 is now in condition for allowance for reasons similar to the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on May 17, 2010 by being
(a) transmitted via the USPTO's electronic filing system;
or
(b) transmitted by facsimile to 571-273-8300; or
(c) deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope with sufficient postage addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450.

/ Samuel G. Campbell, III /

Samuel G. Campbell, III

May 17, 2010

Date

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell, III /

Samuel G. Campbell, III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
512-439-5084 (direct)
512-439-5099 (fax)